

**From:** [Shawn Ghose](#)  
**To:** [jean.mescher@mckesson.com](mailto:jean.mescher@mckesson.com)  
**Subject:** 2 Questions about 3rd FYR  
**Date:** 03/16/2011 05:14 PM

---

Jean : The risk assessor stated the following re: dioxin

I have reviewed the Five Year Review for the Arkwood Superfund site, and have the following comments:

1. The depth of the cap should be mentioned.
2. Regarding if there are soils remaining with dioxin under the ROD's PRG of 20 ug/kg (as 2378 TCDD equivalents), the following language should be inserted:

“EPA's dioxin reassessment has been developed and undergone review over many years with the participation of scientific experts in EPA and other federal agencies, as well as scientific experts in the private sector and academia. The Agency followed current cancer guidelines and incorporated the latest data and physiological/biochemical research into the assessment. The results of the assessment have currently not been finalized have not been adopted into state or federal standards. In addition, EPA/OSWER has proposed to revise the interim preliminary remediation goals (PRGs) for dioxin and dioxin-like compounds, based on technical assessment of scientific and environmental data. However, EPA has not made any final decisions on interim PRGs at this time. Therefore, the dioxin toxicity reassessment for this Site will be updated during the next Five Year Review.”

Should this go under Q B changes in toxicity??? Also can I say that the standards for PCP remain unchanged as well as C-pnas. The value for dioxin has undergone reassessment by EPA. However the preliminary remediation goals ( PRGs) for Dioxin and Dioxin like compounds have not been finalized at this time. Therefore the dioxin toxicity reassessment will be updated during next Five Year Review. As long as Site cap undisturbed..... Also what is the thickness of the cap--- should be mentioned and

where is the best place to put the thickness of the cap???